UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,577	08/29/2002	Glenn Dranoff	50059/005002	5254

2101 7590 01/09/2007
BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP
125 SUMMER STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110-1618

EXAMINER	
DAVIS, MINH TAM B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1642	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/762,577	DRANOFF ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MINH-TAM DAVIS	1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 October 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *18,19,21-23 and 50-52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *55 and 56* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *18-19, 21-23, 50-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/12/01
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Applicant cancels claims 20, 57-62.

Accordingly, claims 18-19, 21-23, 50-52, 55-56 are being examined.

Claims 55-56 are free of prior art and are allowable.

It is noted that the restriction requirement of the previous Office action of 06/06/06 is made FINAL.

This application contains claims 18-19, 21-23 drawn to nonelected inventions, SEQ ID NO:14-16. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Information Disclosure Statement

The references submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement of 03/12/2001 have been reviewed and a signed PTO-1449 is enclosed therehere.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph, Scope of Enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 50-52 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the polynucleotide SEQ ID NO:11, the encoded polypeptide thereof induces production of an antibody thereof in sera of melanoma or lung cancer patients in a higher amount as compared to that of normal controls, does not reasonably provide enablement for a "vaccine" for inducing anti-MAIAP antibody comprising a nucleic acid encoding a tumor antigen, which tumor antigen is encoded by SEQ ID NO:11 for reasons already set forth in paper of 06/06/06. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The response asserts that the claim amendment has obviated the rejection.

The response has been considered but is not found to be persuasive for the following reasons:

It is noted that a vaccine encompasses a composition for in vivo use for treatment of disease, such as cancer as contemplated in the specification.

As amended, the claims 50-52 still reasonably read on a vaccine for use in gene therapy, in which the MAIAP nucleic acid SEQ ID NO:11 is comprised in a vector and expressed in a host cell, wherein the expression of SEQ ID NO:11 results in the production of an antibody against the expressed encoded MAIAP protein.

One, however, cannot predict that the nucleic acid SEQ ID NO:11 could be successfully used as a vaccine for expressing SEQ ID NO:11 in gene therapy, and inducing antibody against the encoded polypeptide thereof, for treating disease, such as cancer, because of the following reasons: 1) Gene therapy is highly unpredictable, as taught by Miller et al, Deonarian et al,

Verma et al, and Crystal et al, all of record, and 2) Further, immunotherapy is also highly unpredictable. White et al, 2001 (Ann Rev Med, 52: 125-145), teach that for a successful immunotherapy, besides the specificity of the antigen, other following properties of the antigen should also be considered: The antigen should be present on all or near all of the malignant cells to allow effective targeting and to prevent a subpopulation of antigen-negative cells from proliferating. Further, antibodies have been developed against a broad spectrum of antigens, and whether the antigens shed, modulate or internalize influence the effectiveness of the administered antibody (p.126, second paragraph). Moreover, antigen internalization or down-regulation can cause repeat dosing to be unsuccessful due to the disappearance of the antibody target (p.126, paragraph before last). Furthermore, cancer tolerance is a well known phenomenon. Boon, 1992 (Adv Can Res, 58:177-210) teaches that for active immunization in human patients we have to stimulate immune defenses of organisms that have often carried a large tumor burden. Establishment of immune tolerance may therefore have occurred and it may prevent immunization and several lines of evidence suggest that large tumor burdens can tolerize or at least depress the capability to respond against the tumor (p. 206, para 2). In addition, Boon teaches that even if activated CTLs are significantly increased, the therapeutic success remains unpredictable due to inconsistencies in antigen expression or presentation by tumor cells (p.178, paragraph before last paragraph). Ezzell, 1995 (J. NIH Res, 7:46-49) reviews the current thinking in cancer vaccines and states that tumor immunologists are reluctant to place bets on which cancer vaccine approach will prove effective in the long run (see the entire document, particularly last paragraph) and further states that no one is very optimistic that a single peptide will trigger an immune response strong enough to eradicate tumors or even to prevent the later

growth of micrometastases among patients whose tumors have been surgically removed or killed by radiation or chemotherapy (p 48, para 6). In addition, Spitler, 1995 (Cancer Biotherapy, 10:1-3) recognizes the lack of predictability of the nature of the art when she states that "Ask practicing oncologists what they think about cancer vaccines and you're likely to get the following response: "cancer vaccines don't work". Ask a venture capitalist or the director of product development at a large pharmaceutical company and you're likely to get the same response." (p 1, para 1). Gura, 1997, (Science, 278:1041-1042) teaches that researchers face the problem of sifting through potential anticancer agents to find ones promising enough to make human clinical trials worthwhile and teach that since formal screening began in 1955, many thousands of drugs have shown activity in either cell or animal models but that only 39 have actually been shown to be useful for chemotherapy (p. 1041, see first and second para). Further, the refractory nature of cancer to drugs is well known in the art. Jain, 1994 (Sci. Am., 271:58-65) teaches that tumors resist penetration by drugs (p.58, col 1) and that scientists need to put expanded effort into uncovering the reasons why therapeutic agents that show encouraging promise in the laboratory often turn out to be ineffective in the treatment of common solid tumors (p. 65, col 3). Curti, 1993 (Crit. Rev. in Oncology/Hematology, 14:29-39) teaches that solid tumors resist destruction by chemotherapy agents and that although strategies to overcome defense mechanisms of neoplastic cells have been developed and tested in a number of patients, success has been limited and further teaches that it is certainly possible that cancer cells possess many as yet undefined additional molecular mechanisms to defeat chemotherapy treatment strategies and if this is true, designing effective chemotherapeutic regimens for solid tumors may prove a daunting task (para bridging pages 29-30) and concludes that knowledge about the

physical barriers to drug delivery in tumors is a work in progress (p. 36, col 2). In addition, Hartwell et al (Science, 1997, 278:1064-1068) teach that an effective chemotherapeutic must selectively kill tumor cells, that most anticancer drugs have been discovered by serendipity and that the molecular alterations that provide selective tumor cell killing are unknown and that even understanding the detailed molecular mechanism by which a drug acts often provides little insight into why the treated tumor cell dies (para bridging pages 1064-1065) and Jain (cited supra) specifically teaches that systemic treatment typically consists of chemotherapeutic drugs that are toxic to dividing cells (p. 58, col 2, para 2). For the reasons set forth above, one cannot predict that the claimed nucleic acid SEQ ID NO:11 could be used successfully as a vaccine for expressing the nucleic acid in a treated host, and inducing antibody against the encoded polypeptide thereof, for treating disease, such as cancer.

Given the above unpredictability, and in view of the complex nature of the invention, a lack of sufficient disclosure in the specification, and little is known in the art concerning the claimed invention, it would have been undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH-TAM DAVIS whose telephone number is 571-272-0830. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SHANON FOLEY can be reached on 571-272-0898. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MINH TAM DAVIS

12/06/06

SHANON A. FOLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER